

Case Number:	CM15-0161406		
Date Assigned:	10/08/2015	Date of Injury:	07/25/2014
Decision Date:	11/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/17/2015

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
 State(s) of Licensure: California, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The injured worker is a 39 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 7-25-14. A review of the medical records indicates he is undergoing treatment for contusion of the right knee, closed fracture of the tibia: status-post surgical procedure and hardware removal procedure, and derangement of lateral meniscus of the knee. Medical records (6-5-15 to 6-25-15) indicate "recurring" pain on the side of the right knee. He rates his pain "3-4 out of 10". He is noted to be "status post 6 weeks after removal of hardware" of the fractured right tibial plateau. He reports his pain is "not as before, but still has some". He also complains of numbness throughout the shin area. The physical exam (6-25-15) reveals that the injured worker is "feeling better". Limited active range of motions is noted, indicating it "lacks 10 of full extension". The treating provider indicates "slight pain on palpation in the area of the scar". He is using crutches (6-25-15). The 6-12-15 progress record indicates that the injured worker has "failed conservative therapy with non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medications, muscle relaxants, physical therapy, and a TENS unit". A request for authorization of a percutaneous peripheral nerve stimulator was requested. Treatment has included physical therapy, encouragement of continued walking, and the use of Norco. The treating provider indicates that the injured worker is "still post-op but we are trying to cut back on the meds". The utilization review (7-15-15) includes requests for authorization of Gabapentin 300mg #60, peripheral nerve stimulator - 4 treatments over 30 days, and Norco 10-325 #60. All requests were denied.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

Norco 10/325mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids "Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: Pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the 4 A's (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any aberrant drug-taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs." Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of norco nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. UDS dated 5/2015 was negative for prescribed opiates. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Gabapentin 300mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

Decision rationale: With regard to anti-epilepsy drugs, the MTUS CPMTG states "Fibromyalgia: Gabapentin and pregabalin have been found to be safe and efficacious to treat pain and other symptoms. (Arnold, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) Pregabalin is FDA approved for fibromyalgia." Per MTUS CPMTG, "Gabapentin (Neurontin) has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and post-herpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain." Per MTUS CPMTG p17, "After initiation of treatment there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects." The documentation submitted for review did not contain evidence of improvement in function. As such, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.